

December 20, 2006  
Case No.: NL02 0444 US (7790/470)  
Serial No.: 10/516,626  
Filed: November 30, 2004  
Page 5 of 7

**REMARKS**

In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Geib rejected pending claims 1-10 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.112:

A. Examiner Geib rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite for reciting the term “substantially”

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 to delete the term “substantially” from independent claims 1 and 9. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite is therefore respectfully requested.

B. Examiner Geib rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,956,518 to *DeHon* et al.

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Geib’s remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-10 over *DeHon*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *DeHon*. To warrant this §102(b) rejection of claims 1-10, *DeHon* must show each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 9 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1 and 9. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claims 1 and 9, because, among other things, *DeHon* fails to show “the plurality of processing elements are layed out in a regular grid with the issuing means being external to the regular grid” in as complete detail as recited in amended independent claim 1, and laying out the plurality of processing elements in a regular grid with the issuing means being external to the regular grid” in as complete detail as recited in amended independent claim 9. Specifically, as shown in FIGS.

December 20, 2006  
Case No.: NL02 0444 US (7790/470)  
Serial No.: 10/516,626  
Filed: November 30, 2004  
Page 6 of 7

1-5, *DeHon* fails to teach or suggest issuing means being external to the regular grid of processing elements 100. See, Dehon at column 5, line 1 to column 8, line 21.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *DeHon* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-8 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2-8 are allowable over *DeHon* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *DeHon*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *DeHon* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claim 10 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 10 is allowable over *DeHon* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *DeHon*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *DeHon* is therefore respectfully requested.

December 20, 2006  
Case No.: NL02 0444 US (7790/470)  
Serial No.: 10/516,626  
Filed: November 30, 2004  
Page 7 of 7

**SUMMARY**

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Geib is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: December 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,  
BERNARDO DE OLIVEIRA KASTRUP  
PEREIRA

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH  
AMERICA CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY &  
STANDARDS  
1109 McKay Drive, M/S-41SJ  
San Jose, California 95131

---

Paul Im  
Registration No. 50,418  
Attorney for Applicant



---

Darrin Wesley Harris  
Registration No. 40,636  
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113